

INTRODUCTION

The following is the report of the SFDE Drafting Committee on district boundaries and related questions for the 1976 initiative campaign for District Election of Supervisors.

The Drafting Committee, made up of 80 community representatives elected at 16 community hearings held in virtually every SF community, met six times over a period of two weeks to draw up the enclosed initiative plan. In its work, the Drafting Committee was guided by three basic considerations: (1) the need for districts to respect neighborhood integrity as much as possible; (2) the need for districts to be based upon common interests and needs among different neighborhoods, thus making it possible for different neighborhoods within a district to join together and elect a supervisor who truly represents all of them; (3) and, of course, the need for districts to be approximately equal in population, as the law requires.

These considerations did not always mesh together perfectly. It took the Drafting Committee two weeks and over 30 hours of spirited meetings to turn these general considerations, and the specific concerns of 16 community hearings, into a concrete plan for district election of supervisors. The fact that they did so at all is proof that we can transcend the immediate concerns of our individual communities, and cooperate with each other to create a plan which makes it possible for all of our communities to work together towards real political power for the people of San Francisco.

If we can approve this plan today, it will enable us to continue the Drafting Committee's good work by getting on with the job of putting District Election of Supervisors on the ballot and getting it passed by the voters in November.

"WE GOT THE SOLUTION. THE SOLUTION IS UNITY"

-from the Attica Manifesto

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE BOUNDARY-DRAWING PROCESS

I. COMMUNITY HEARINGS HELD.

On Jan. 10, 1976, over 120 community residents and activists from all over San Francisco met to begin planning an initiative campaign for district election of supervisors. At that meeting it was agreed that the first step was for the communities of San Francisco to get together and draw district boundaries, and a process for accomplishing this was initiated.

The process consisted of community hearings to be held in all areas of the City, at which people could discuss how district lines should be drawn, and elect their own representatives to serve on a city-wide Drafting Committee which would actually draw the district boundaries for the initiative.

In all, 16 community hearings were held throughout the City. They were sponsored by 130 community and neighborhood organizations and activists; 500 people attended these hearings.

There were many diverse opinions expressed at the community hearings, and 80 people were elected to the Drafting Committee, representing both majority and minority viewpoints from the hearings. The Drafting Committee was then tasked to take the results of the community hearings and turn it into a plan for the district elections initiative.

II. THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETS.

The Drafting Committee met for the first time on April 8, 1976, with over 50 people in attendance. The Committee agreed that it had three basic tasks to perform: to decide how many districts there should be; to draw the boundaries of these districts; and to make recommendations on the "peripheral" questions concerning the initiative--length of terms, pay, etc. The Committee then decided to begin its work by asking each community hearing delegation to report on the results of its hearing. This was done, and the reports were discussed, with people noting that, of the 16 hearings held, 14 had favored 11 districts while 2 had favored 15 districts. At this point, an initial discussion was held on the question of how many districts there should be, with various positions being stated and debated. Then, a straw vote was taken, with the understanding that the question would be taken up again at the next Committee meeting on April 10, for final decision. The straw vote was overwhelmingly in favor of 11 districts.

Next, the question of district boundaries was briefly discussed, and it was decided that, since there were so many conflicts with hearing boundaries and population numbers, hearing delegates should caucus with each other and try to work out understandings prior to discussion of boundaries by the whole group.

Finally, there was a discussion of the "peripheral" questions, after which it was agreed that these questions would be decided at a joint meeting of the Drafting Committee and the SFDE Coordinating Committee. The Drafting Committee was then recessed until Saturday, April 10.

III. THE NUMBER OF DISTRICTS.

The Drafting Committee reconvened on April 10, and the first question taken up was the number of districts. Arguments favoring 15 districts were

raised, primarily focusing on the possibility for better neighborhood representation with the larger number of districts. Proponents of 11 districts pointed out that several larger communities would have to be divided with a 15 district plan. In addition, many people felt that a 15-district plan could not win at the polls, since it raised several problems (such as increased costs, too much change, etc) which would be used to argue against district elections and distract attention from the real issue of district elections--gaining political power for the peoples and communities of San Francisco. After discussion, a vote was taken on the question, and the vast majority voted for an 11-district plan.

IV. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES.

The next question taken up was the question of district boundaries. As previously agreed, caucuses were formed in which representatives of different hearings met with each other to discuss conflicts between their hearing reports. These caucuses met for most of the day on Saturday, after which they made reports to the Drafting Committee as a whole. These reports indicated that several areas of agreement had been reached, primarily around the edges of the City, and that there were several areas where conflicts still had not been resolved, primarily in the center of the City. The Drafting Committee decided, on the basis of these reports, to continue the caucus procedure, this time asking all representatives from larger areas of the City to caucus together and try to reach agreement on boundaries for that area. This process continued throughout the day on Sunday, April 11, after which reports were again made to the Drafting Committee as a whole. These reports indicated that substantial progress had been made, but that several areas were still in question. It was generally agreed that it would now be fruitful to attempt drawing a full 11-district plan, reflecting as much as possible the agreements already reached. At this point, recognizing that the Committee as a whole could not meet again for 4 or 5 days, a sub-committee, consisting of one representative chosen by each hearing delegation was tasked to meet and draw up a plan for consideration by the whole Drafting Committee at its next meeting. This sub-committee met, and after much discussion of individual neighborhood positions, recognized that there could not be a "perfect" plan. It was agreed that the goal should be a plan that, while reflecting neighborhood interests as much as possible, would ultimately benefit all those communities and peoples who are now excluded from representation on the Board of Supervisors, and thus excluded from the political power to determine their own futures. With this in mind, a plan was adopted by the sub-committee for presentation to the whole Drafting Committee.

This plan was presented to the Drafting Committee on Monday, April 19. After lengthy discussion, including votes on many amendments to the sub-committee's map, final boundaries were approved by the Drafting Committee.

V. THE PERIPHERAL QUESTIONS.

The issue of the peripheral questions for the initiative was taken up at a joint meeting of the Drafting Committee and the SFDE Coordinating Committee on Tuesday, April 13, 1976. Each of the specific questions was discussed at some length, but in each case it was generally agreed that potential advantages of changing certain provisions would be more than offset by the danger that these questions would confuse the issue of district elections and lead to defeat in November. Thus, for example, while many people

felt that a real community-based Supervisors would deserve and need more salary than the present ones receive, everyone agreed that it would be harmful to the basic goal of district elections to have the campaign also include a pay raise ofr Supervisors and more costs for taxpayers.

Thus, it was decided to leave the peripheral issues concerning the election of supervisors unchanged, in order to keep the central issue of district elections clear. This means that our initiative would have the following provisions:

1. Terms of Office. Remains at 4 years; staggered terms will be continued. Thus, if the initiative passes in 1976, all supervisors will be elected from district in 1977. Then, half of them (to be determined by lots) will have to run again in 1979 for four-year terms, and the other half will run again in 1981.
2. Rate of Pay. No change; still \$9600/year.
3. Reapportionment. After the 1980 census, the district lines will have to be redrawn. Our initiative would state that new lines must be consistent with preserving neighborhood integrity and must recognize the one person-one vote principle. Under state law, the Board of Supervisor (elected by Districts) would be responsible for actually drawing the new lines, within a process requiring public hearings.

VI. THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE APPROVES.

This final plan was presented to the SFDE Coordinating Committee on Thursday, April 22. The Coordinating Committee recognized that the district boundaries were not perfect, but felt that they would well serve the political needs of the City as a whole, by providing districts in which community people could work together to elect representatives who would honestly represent the needs and desires of the City's people. The Coordinating Committee unanimously endorsed the Drafting Committee's plan, and strongly recommends it for approval by the general membership.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

The following groups and individuals supported the development of a new plan for the election of Supervisors by community districts by either sponsoring/hosting a neighborhood hearing or by endorsing the citywide district election concept. Hearings were held as follows:

Richmond - Feb. 16

Noe/Eureka/Duboce - March 6

Potrero Hill - March 10

Market Area Senior Citizens - March 17

North & South Market - March 20

Hunters Point - March 23

Western Addition - March 24

Chinatown - March 25

Mission - March 27

Sunset - March 30

Haight Ashbury/Inner Sunset -
March 31

Bernal Heights - March 31

Ingleside - April 3

Visitacion/Portola Valleys - Apr 3

Pacific Heights, Marina, Russian
& Telegraph Hills - April 5

Excelsior/Outer Mission - April 6

Supporting Groups & Individuals

Asian Coalition

Asian/Americans for Effective Education

Rahemah Amun

Armida Adan

Rita Adrian

Karl Ardo

Art Agnos

Association of Chinese Teachers

Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Francis Brown, Legislative Council for
Older Americans

Assemblyman Willie Brown

Joseph Brajkovich

Connie Blank

Bayview/Hunters Point Comm. Government

Gordon Brownell

Black Teachers Caucus

Keith Beggs

Sue Bierman, City Planning Commission

Congressman John L. Burton

Castro Village Association

Cora L. Cruz

Rosemary Contreros

Versa Cullen

Claude Carpenter

Centro de Cambio

Concerned People's Law School Workers

Chinches American Democratic Club

Chinese YMCA

Cameron House

Chinese/American Naturalized Citizens
Assn.

Emory Curtis

Bevo Coleman, Canon Kip Community House

Citizens Committee on Yerba Buena Center

Citizens for Representative Government

Bob and Germaine Covington

Duboce Triangle Association

Anna Darden

Ed Dunn

Anne B. Daley

Delancy Street

Claude Everhardt

Eureka Valley Promotion Assn.

Terrance Falukner

Lawrence Flemming

Marc Frauenfelder

Folsom Park Youth Organization

Four-O-Nine House

Federation of Ingleside Neighbors

Filipino/American So. of Market

Neighborhood Assn.

Ted Frazier, San Francisco Coalition

Fred Furth

Garfield Youth Organization

Bobbie Griffith

Hugh Griffith

Kevin Gonzalves

Dr. Carlton Goodlett

Humanists of San Francisco

Sue Hestor

Hunters Point Coordinating Comm.

Horizons Unlimited

Health-PAC West

Leonard Heinz

Robin Hood

Pat Helton

Jin Haas

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Haight Ashbury Center for Alcohol
Problems

Haight Ashbury Switchboard

Haight Ashbury Community Food Store

Haight Ashbury Arts Workshop

Inner Sunset Action Committee

SFDE SPONSORSHIP LIST CONT'D


APRIL 1976

Inner Sunset Action Committee	Real Alternatives Program
International Hotel Tenants Assn.	Cleo Rand
Espinola Jackson	Mary Rogers
Walter Jebe	Southwest Neighborhood Improve- ment Assn.
Jail Health Coalition	Henry Schindel
Michael Rollie Jones	San Francisco Black Political Caucus
League of United Latin American Citizens	San Francisco Community Congress
Robert Laughton	San Francisco Tomorrow
Lorraine Lahr	San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
La Raza En Accion Local	Carol Ruth Silver
Jean Mellor	Syanyan/Fulton Association
Lee Meyerzove, Central City Coalition	Street Artists Coalition
Peter Mendelshon	Arnold Townsend
Ernie Mitchell	Tenants and Owners in Opposition to Redevelopment
Robert Mazyck	Rev. Joseph Tringali, Sr.
Charles Mattalia	Ben Tom
Rev. Bill Miller, Hamilton Methodist	Joe Topacio
Pat Morston	United Health Alliance
Mission Youth Project	Edison Uno
Mission Family Center	Claudia Viek
Mission Childcare Consortium	Winfield/Elsie Block Club
Mission Mental Health Center	Western Addition Project Area Committee
Mission Youth Media Arts	Yori Wada
Mission Town Hall Meeting	Rosalind Wolf
Mississippi House	Fr. Walker, All Saints Church
Enola Maxwell	Youth for Service
Harvey Mild	
Joseph Minihan	
Network Against Psychiatric Assault	
Northern California Alliance	
New American Movement	
Nob Hill Town Hall Meeting	
North of Market Senior Organization	
Neighborhood Foundation	
Northwest Bernal Block Club	
Raymond Nevilles	
OMI Trucking Company	
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House	
Potrero Hill Community Government	
Potrero Hill Citizens Improvement Assn.	
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors	
Potrero View	
Planning Association for the Richmond	
Peace and Freedom Party	
People Against MacDonalds	
Ruth Pierce	
Precita Center	
Prisoners Health Project	
Patrick Quinn, BAGL	
Richmond Asian Caucus	
Donna Roberts	
Raymond J. Raymond	

PROPOSED 1976 DISTRICT ELECTIONS INITIATIVE PLAN

April 24, 1976

1. DISTRICT BOUNDARIES



DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

DISTRICT 1.

From Ocean beach east along Fulton St. to Stanyan, north on Stanyan to Geary, west on Geary to Arguello, north on Arguello to West Pacific, west on West Pacific and following Lobos Creek to the ocean, south along the ocean to Fulton.

DISTRICT 2.

Beginning at the intersection of Fulton and Stanyan: east along Fulton to Masonic, north on Masonic to Turk, east on Turk to St. Joseph's, north on St. Joseph's to Geary, west on Geary to Presidio, north on Presidio to California, east on California to Van Ness, north on Van Ness to Filbert, east on Filbert to Leavenworth, North on Leavenworth to the bay, west along the bay to Lobos Creek.

DISTRICT 3.

Beginning at the intersection of California and Van Ness: east along California to Leavenworth, south on Leavenworth to Post, east on Post to Market, northeast on Market to Battery, north on Battery to Jackson, east on Jackson to Front, north on Front to Broadway, east on Broadway to the bay, north along the bay to Leavenworth, south on Leavenworth to Filbert, west on Filbert to Van Ness, south on Van Ness to California.

DISTRICT 4.

Beginning at the intersection of Fulton and Masonic: east along Fulton to Baker, south on Baker to Oak, east on Oak to Divisadero, south on Divisadero to Waller, east on Waller to Market, northeast on Market to Jones, north on Jones to Ellis, west on Ellis to Leavenworth, north on Leavenworth to California, west on California to Presidio, south on Presidio to Geary, east on Geary to St. Joseph's, south on St. Joseph's to Turk, west on Turk to Masonic, south on Masonic to Fulton.

DISTRICT 5.

Beginning at the intersection of Stanyan and Fulton: south on Stanyan to 17th St., east on 17th St. to Clayton, south on Clayton to Market, south on Market to Portola, west on Portola to O'Shaughnessy, southeast on O'Shaughnessy to Del Vale, proceed east across Glen Canyon Park to Gold Mine Drive, east on Gold Mine drive to Diamond Heights Blvd., south on Diamond Heights Blvd. to Diamond St., north on Diamond to 29th St., east on 29th St. to Noe, south on Noe to 30th St., east on 30th St. to Church, north on Church to Market, northeast on Market to Waller.

DISTRICT 6.

Beginning at the intersection of Market and 7th St.: southeast along 7th St.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES (cont'd)

DISTRICT 6 (cont'd)

to Townsend, southwest on Townsend to Division, east on Division to James Lick Freeway, south along James Lick Freeway to Peralta, southwest on Peralta to Mullen, east on Mullen to Alabama, north on Alabama to Bessie, west on Bessie to Mirabel, west on Mirabel to Mission, south on Mission to San Jose, north on San Jose to 30th St., west on 30th St. to Church, north on Church to Market, northeast on Market to 7th St.

DISTRICT 7.

Beginning at the intersection of Market and Jones: north along Jones to Ellis, west on Ellis to Leavenworth, north on Leavenworth to Post, east on Post to Market, northeast on Market to Battery, north on Battery to Jackson, east on Jackson to Front, north on Front to Broadway, east on Broadway to the bay, south along the bay to the county line, west along the county line to the James Lick Freeway, north along the James Lick Freeway to Division, east on Division to Townsend, northeast on Townsend to 7th St., northwest on 7th St. to Market.

DISTRICT 8.

Beginning at the intersection of the county line and the Southern Freeway: northeast along the Southern Freeway to the James Lick Freeway, south along the James Lick Freeway to the county line, west along the county line to the Southern Freeway.

DISTRICT 9.

Beginning at the intersection of the county line and Junipero Serra Blvd.: north along Junipero Serra to Holloway, east on Holloway to Ashton, north on Ashton to Ocean, across Ocean to Keystone, north on Keystone to Kenwood Way, east on Kenwood Way to Upland, west on Upland to North Gate Drive, north on North Gate Drive to Yerba Buena, northwest on Yerba Buena to Miraloma, north on Miraloma to Portola, west on Portola to Juanita, northeast on Juanita to Evelyn, east on Evelyn to O'Shaughnessy, southeast on O'Shaughnessy to Del Vale, proceed east across Glen Canyon Park to Gold Mine Drive, east on Gold Mine Drive to Diamond Heights Blvd., south on Diamond Heights Blvd. to Diamond St., north on Diamond to 29th St., east on 29th St. to Noe, south on Noe to 30th St., east on 30th St. to San Jose, south on San Jose to Mission, north on Mission to Mirabel, east on Mirabel to Bessie, east on Bessie to Alabama, south on Alabama to Mullen, east on Mullen to Peralta, east on Peralta to James Lick Freeway, south along James Lick Freeway to Southern Freeway, southwest along Southern Freeway to county line, west along county line to Junipero Serra.

DISTRICT 10.

Beginning at the intersection of the county line and Junipero Serra Blvd.: north along Junipero Serra to Holloway, east on Holloway to Ashton, north

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES (cont'd)

DISTRICT 10 (cont'd)

on Ashton to Ocean, across Ocean to Keystone, north on Keystone to Kenwood Way, east on Kenwood Way to Upland, west on Upland to North Gate Drive, north on North Gate to Yerba Buena, northwest on Yerba Buena to Miraloma, north on Miraloma to Portola, west on Portola to Juanita, northwest on Juanita to Evelyn, east on Evelyn to O'Shaughnessy, north on O'Shaughnessy to Woodside, west on Woodside to Laguna Honda, northwest on Laguna Honda to Ortega, west on Ortega to 41st Ave., south on 41st Ave. to Pacheco, west on Pacheco to ocean, south along ocean to county line, east along county line to Junipero Serra.

DISTRICT 11.

Beginning at the ocean and Pacheco: east along Pacheco to 41st Ave., north on 41st Ave. to Ortega, east on Ortega to Laguna Honda, south on Laguna Honda to Woodside, southeast on Woodside to Portola, east on Portola to Market, north on Market to Clayton, north on Clayton to 17th St., west on 17th St. to Stanyan, north on Stanyan to Fulton, west on Fulton to the ocean, south along the ocean to Pacheco.

POPULATION IN EACH DISTRICT

(These figures are tentative. Any corrections will be announced during the April 24 meeting).

DISTRICT 1 -- 66,778	DISTRICT 7 -- 65,424
DISTRICT 2 -- 65,543	DISTRICT 8 -- 66,070
DISTRICT 3 -- 66,965	DISTRICT 9 -- 63,164
DISTRICT 4 -- 65,440	DISTRICT 10 -- 64,349
DISTRICT 5 -- 63,298	DISTRICT 11 -- 63,190
DISTRICT 6 -- 65,614	

2. ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS

The SFDE Coordinating Committee and the City-wide Drafting Committee, in a joint meeting, made the following determinations regarding issues associated with the question of the election of Supervisors.

1. Terms of Office. Remains at 4 years; staggered terms will be continued. This, if the initiative passes in 1976, all Supervisors will be elected from districts in 1977. Then, half of them (to be determined by lots) will have to run again in 1979 for four year terms, and the other half will run again in 1981.
2. Rate of Pay. No change; still \$9,600 per year.
3. Reapportionment. After the 1980 census, the district lines will have to be redrawn. Our initiative would state that new lines must be consistent with preserving neighborhood integrity and must recognize the one person-one vote principle. Under state law, the Board of Supervisors (elected by districts) would be responsible for actually drawing the new lines, within a process requiring public hearings.

"IF OUR PEOPLE FIGHT ONE TRIBE AT A TIME,
ALL WILL BE KILLED. THEY CAN CUT OFF OUR
FINGERS ONE BY ONE, BUT IF WE JOIN TOGETHER
WE WILL MAKE A POWERFUL FIST."

- Little Turtle of the Miami Nation
1791

INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED FORTHWITH TO THE ELECTORS

Petition for immediate submission to electors of proposed amendments to the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to create eleven supervisorial districts for the purpose of electing supervisors by district to provide equal representation for equal numbers of people. The reason for the proposed petition is to make City and County government more representative of the varied interests in the City and County.

To the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

We, the undersigned, registered and qualified electors of the State of California, residents of the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to Sections 9.108-9.111 of the City Charter and Section 3 of Article XI of the Constitution of this State, present to the Board of Supervisors this petition and request that the following amendments to the Charter of the City and County be submitted to the registered and qualified electors of the City and County for their adoption or rejection at the general municipal election in November, 1976.

The proposed Charter amendment reads as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.100 Composition and Salary; **Districts.**

The board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected ((at large)) **by districts**. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ninety-six hundred dollars (\$9,600) per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of five thousand dollars (\$5,000).

The city and county is hereby divided into eleven supervisorial districts as hereinafter set forth, and, commencing with the general municipal election in 1977, and continuing thereafter until new districts are established as hereinafter set forth, such districts shall be used for the election or recall of the members of the board of supervisors, and for filling any vacancy in the office of member of the board of supervisors by appointment. Upon the establishment of new districts as hereinafter provided such new districts shall be used for the aforesaid purposes; provided, however, that no change in the boundary or location of any district by redistricting as herein provided shall operate to abolish or terminate the term of office of any member of the board of supervisors prior to the expiration of the term of office for which such member was elected or appointed. The eleven supervisorial districts, as established herein, shall be bounded and described as follows:

(Continued on next page)

For Use of Registrar	Signature of Registered Voter	Street and Number	City	Date of Signing	Headquarters Will Fill in Precinct No.
	1 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	2 Sign _____ Print _____	INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY	San Francisco	76	
	3 Sign _____ Print _____	JUN 23 1976	San Francisco	76	
	4 Sign _____ Print _____	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	San Francisco	76	
	5 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	6 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	7 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	8 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	9 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	10 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	11 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	12 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	13 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	14 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	
	15 Sign _____ Print _____		San Francisco	76	

DECLARATION OF CIRCULATOR

I declare: I am, and during all the time while circulating signatures to this section of the petition was, a qualified and registered voter of the State of California, City and County of San Francisco.

According to my best information and belief: (a) Each signature appearing on this section of the petition is the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be; (b) each signer of this section of the petition was, at the time of placing such signature thereon, a registered qualified voter of the City and County of San Francisco; and (c) I personally observed each signer placing thereon his or her signature, the date thereof, and his or her residence address, by street and number.

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at San Francisco, California, this _____ day of _____, 1976.

Signature of Circulator

Name of Circulator (Printed)

San Francisco, California

Residential Voting Address

Telephone

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CIRCULATING THIS INITIATIVE PETITION

1. If you are a qualified and registered voter of the City and County of San Francisco, you may circulate this petition.
2. Circulate and obtain signatures only in San Francisco. Do not obtain signatures within 100 feet of any election booth, polling place, or any place where registration of voters or electors is being conducted.
3. Any registered voter of San Francisco may sign this petition. Before the person signs the petition, be sure the person has answered YES to the question, "Are you a registered voter in San Francisco?"
4. The petition should be signed exactly as the signer has registered as a voter. (In registering, the voter is required to sign his or her full name, including his or her given name and middle name or initial.) A married woman should sign her own given name, not her husband's. For example, Mary N. Smith should sign her name "Mrs. Mary N. Smith."
5. The signer must write in the petition his or her name, the street and number of the address where he or she is registered, and the month and day of signing. December 7, 1972, may be written "12-7-72".
6. The signer must use indelible pencil or ink (ball point is all right).
7. Ditto marks may NOT be used.
8. Do not write anything in the first or last columns, headed by "For use of Registrar" and "Precinct No."
9. Each signature must be secured by you and signed in your presence.
10. Do not leave a petition anywhere to be signed during your absence.
11. As soon as you have obtained all the signatures you can get on each petition, fill in the "Declaration of Circulator," signing your full name, your registered voting address, the date, and your telephone number.
12. This petition in its entirety is to be returned to the address shown below so that further provisions of the law applying to initiative petitions may be carried out.

When completed return to:

360 - 23rd Ave

